



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/541,719	04/14/2006	Eung Jc Woo	16143.10	9815
22913	7590	10/18/2007	EXAMINER	
WORKMAN NYDEGGER			ROZANSKI, MICHAEL T	
60 EAST SOUTH TEMPLE				
1000 EAGLE GATE TOWER			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111			3768	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/18/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/541,719	WOO ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Michael Rozanski	3768	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

1)  Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 September 2007.

2a)  This action is **FINAL**.                    2b)  This action is non-final.

3)  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## **Disposition of Claims**

4)  Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) 10-20 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6)  Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.

7)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

9)  The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)  The drawing(s) filed on 08 July 2005 is/are: a)  accepted or b)  objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)  All    b)  Some \* c)  None of:

1.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3.  Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/8/05.  
4)  Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date.       .  
5)  Notice of Informal Patent Application  
6)  Other:       .

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Election/Restrictions***

1. Applicant's election with traverse of Group I, claims 1-9 in the reply filed on 9/21/07 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that since groups I and II are classified together, there would not be a serious search burden on the Examiner. This is not found persuasive because, as stated in the requirement or restriction, the product can be used in a materially different process. While the two groups may be classified in the same class, this does not necessarily indicate that two groups will use the same search criteria.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

### ***Double Patenting***

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-9 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-9 of copending Application No. 10/595,980. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the copending application features a system for visualizing conductivity and current density comprising current injecting devices, a measuring unit (i.e. MRI scanner), an operating unit, and displaying means, which is essentially what is claimed in the current application.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims **1 and 3-9** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by *Eyuboglu et al* (US 6,397,095).

Eyuboglu et al disclose a Magnetic Resonance-Electrical Impedance Tomography technique. MR-EIT is set up by positioning a plurality of electrodes connected by wires 30 on the surface of the object under study, an MR scanner 60 for

measuring one directional component of a magnetic flux due to each of the currents injected, displaying means 50 for visualizing conductivity and current density distributions, and measurement circuitry 40 for reading the voltage measurements. Using MRCDI, the spatial distribution of the current generated within the object and measured by circuitry 40 is determined at the same time as potentials for the surface of the object are determined with electrodes. Further, current is applied to all possible electrode pairs, sequentially or in succession. Once the current density and the potential gradient inside the volume conductor are known, the local conductivity of the volume may be calculated. In another approach, the potential distribution is calculated and the gradient of the potential field is determined. The algorithm is iterated until a minimum error between the two values is obtained (col 4, line 9-col 5, line 55).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

***Eyuboglu et al.***

Eyugboglu et al substantially disclose all features of the current invention but do not specifically disclose an insulating container having an electrolyte substance. However, it is known in the art that an electrolytic substance is needed for electrical

contact between the electrode and tissue. It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated a container with electrolyte attached to the electrode to facilitate electrical contact.

**Conclusion**

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Rozanski whose telephone number is 571-272-1648. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eleni Mantis-Mercader can be reached on 571-272-4740. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

*MR*  
MR

*Brkbl*  
Brkbl, Esq.  
Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher  
120 Wall Street  
New York, NY 10005-4001  
(212) 506-6000  
(212) 506-6001 (FAX)